



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/036,991	12/31/2001	William E. Ryan JR.	F-424	5304

919 7590 04/14/2006

PITNEY BOWES INC.
35 WATERVIEW DRIVE
P.O. BOX 3000
MSC 26-22
SHELTON, CT 06484-8000

EXAMINER

JASTRZAB, KRISANNE MARIE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1744

DATE MAILED: 04/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

5

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

04112006

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.


Commissioner for Patents

The reply brief filed 2/6/2006 has been entered and considered. The application has been forwarded to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for decision on the appeal.

Responsive to reply brief on 2/6/2006, a supplemental Examiner's Answer is set forth below: Appellant argues that Call does not support a filtered transition area between the sanitation area and the output bin, however, the Examiner would point out that the claim does not require that it be between, merely that the filtered transition area be downstream of the sanitation area and Call clearly supports filtered transition downstream of sanitizing. Appellant further argues that Call does not have support from the provisional, for a clean room area containing the output module outside the sanitizing chamber, however, the Examiner would disagree and maintain that both the provisional and the published application teach an outer room that has a HEPA filtered airflow to isolate it from ambient, containing at least a portion of the output module and being outside of the containment chamber housing the sanitizing station. See page 13, lines 10-15 and Fig. 1 of the provisional and page 7, paragraphs 0108 and 0109, and page 9, paragraph 0121 of the published application. Finally, Appellant argues that the provisional application does not properly provide support for the incoming mail handler to provide singulating in the published application, however, the Examiner would disagree and point to page 11, line 19 and page 15, line 25 which both recite separating incoming mail and orienting it for individual passage which is "singulating" and clearly supports the language at pages 7-8 of the published application.

Appellant may file another reply brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.41 within two months of the date of mailing of this supplemental examiner's answer. Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are not applicable to this two month time period. See 37 CFR 41.43(b)-(c).

A Technology Center Director or designee has approved this supplemental examiner's answer by signing below:


Krisanne Jastrzab
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1744